

Remarks/Arguments

Summary

By this Amendment, independent claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended, and dependent claims 17-19 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-19 are now pending in the application.

35 U.S.C. ¶102 and ¶103

By this Amendment, independent claims 1, 7 and 13 have been revised to even more clearly define over the reference relied on by the Examiner in the rejections under 35 U.S.C. ¶102 and ¶103. In particular, as described in the present specification, the present invention is primarily directed to the processing of a layer which is deposited by CVD and then planarized by CMP. See, for example, para. [0060]. As recited in the independent claims, the processed layer is initially deposited as a single and continuous layer.

The present claims clearly define over the teachings of the references of record. For example, in the rejection based on Nakano et al., it appears that the Examiner has equated the combination of silicon wafer 1' and underlying oxide 5 (see FIG. 1(f)) as the "deposited layer" of the present claims. However, these elements of Nakano et al. do not constitute a single and continuous layer as recited in the present claims, and these elements are not CVD deposited as recited in new dependent claims 17-19.

Likewise, the structure illustrated in FIG. 2E of Okada is a multi-layer stack structure including a first insulating layer 102a, an electrode layer 104a, and a second insulating layer 106, all formed in separate deposition steps. These elements of Nakano et al. do not constitute a single and continuous layer as recited in the present claims, and these elements not a single and continuous CVD deposited layer as recited in new dependent claims 17-19. Moreover, the present invention is generally directed

to removal of the non-uniform and thick portions of a deposited layer after planarization of the layer. In contrast, Okada is directed to removal of multiple thin layers at the wafer periphery regardless of any non-uniformity there.

For at least the reasons stated above and the reasons already of record, Applicants respectfully contend that claims 1-19 are neither anticipated by, nor rendered obvious in view of, the teachings of the cited references, taken individually or in combination.

Conclusion

No other issues remaining, reconsideration and favorable action upon the claims 1-19 now present in the application are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE FRANCOS & WHITT, PLLC

By:



Adam C. Volentine
Reg. No. 33,289

March 15, 2005

VOLENTINE FRANCOS & WHITT, PLLC
12200 Sunrise Valley Drive, Suite 150
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 715-0870